

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Office Action dated May 3, 2007 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 11 and 12 as anticipated by S.U. Patent 1,745,873 to Kiselman et al. and indicated that claims 13-17 are allowed and claims 3, 5, and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thoroughness of his consideration. Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully traverse the rejections for the reasons set out below.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-12 as anticipated by S.U. Patent 1,745,873 to Kiselman et al.

Applicants respectfully dispute Examiner's assertion that "The cage (3) and extendable sectors (6) [of Kiselman] are integral." Figures 3 and 4 of Kiselman, which are cross-sectional views of the device in expanded and un-expanded modes, respectively, clearly show, via cross-hatching, that cage (3) and sectors (6) are not integral. Rather, they are separate segments and must be separate in order to function in the manner disclosed by Kiselman. Thus, Kiselman does not disclose a device meeting the limitations of claim 1 as previously submitted.

Nonetheless, in order expedite allowance of this application, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of former claims 2 and 3, which have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment places the claims in condition for allowance.

Allowable claims

The Examiner indicated that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Because the limitations of claim 3 have been incorporated into claim 1, claim 1 is therefore allowable, as are claims 4-6, 8-12, and 18 which depend from it..

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, from which it formerly depended.

The Examiner allowed claims 13-17 and 19, for which Applicants thank the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to enter the amendments and allow

the case. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of the claims that can be corrected by telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

LOHBECK, Wilhelmus Christianus Maria

By: Marcella D. Watkins
Attorney, Marcella D. Watkins
Reg. No. 36,962
(713) 241-1041

P.O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463